

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 10, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at page 8, lines 13-20 and page 11, lines 5-19. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,614,987 to Ismail et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,629,733 to Youman et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,207 to Sumita et al.

Claims 2 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ismail et al., Youman et al. and Sumita et al. as applied to claims 1 and 10, and further in view of Dunlop ("The Effects of Accessing Non-matching Documents on Relevance Feedback") and U.S. Patent No. 6,408,295 to Aggarwal et al.

Claims 4-6 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ismail et al., Youman et al. and Sumita et al. as applied to claims 3 and 12, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,561 to Hawkins et al.

Claims 7 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ismail et al., Youman et al. and Sumita et al. as applied to claims 3 and 12, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,457,010 to Eldering et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,360 to Inoue et al.

Claims 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ismail et al., Youman et al. and Sumita et al. as applied to claims 3 and 12, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,664 B1 to Russel-Falla et al.

Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Ismail et al., Youman et al. and Sumita et al. as applied to claims 1 and 10, and further in view of Eldering et al.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A broadcasting system...wherein...

said user activates or deactivates the filtering process at any time, otherwise a controlling unit automatically activates or deactivates the filtering process;

said plurality of reception apparatuses store said digital contents that match said user preferences even if said user does not reserve said digital contents...”
(emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 6,614,987 to Ismail et al. relates to a system for recording television programs for subsequent viewing by a user that includes a preference determination module which is responsive to attribute information associated with

television programs viewed by the user. The preference determination module categorizes the attribute information in accordance with categorization parameters to generate recordation preference information, indicative of television program viewing preferences of the user. The system also includes a recordation module which is responsive to the recordation preference information, for causing recordation on a storage medium of subsequently transmitted television programs, having attribute information corresponding to the recordation preference information.

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 5,629,733 to Youman et al. relates to an electronic program schedule system which includes a receiver for receiving broadcast, satellite or cablecast television programs for a plurality of television channels and a tuner for tuning a television receiver to a selected one of the plurality of channels. A data processor receives and stores in a memory television program schedule information for a plurality of television programs to appear on the plurality of television channels.

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 6,581,207 to Sumita et al. relates to an information-filtering unit that is connected with a user's video equipment by a communications line and a program content analyzing section that analyzes the contents of broadcast programs from a broadcasting station in terms of information such as video and sound. A collation evaluation section evaluates the similarity between the analyses and a user's profile stored in a profile storage section. A program selecting selection transmits the result of program selection to the video equipment in the form of time information.

Applicants submit that Ismail, Youman, and Sumita, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of a user that activates or deactivates a filtering process at any time, otherwise a controlling unit automatically activates or deactivates

the filtering process or a plurality of reception apparatuses that store digital contents that match a user preferences even if the user does not reserve the digital contents, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in the art used as a basis for rejection of the dependent claims that would render claim 1 obvious.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, amended independent claim 10 is also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800